

REMARKS

In reviewing the Examiner's comments concerning the rejections made in the parent application, it has become apparent that the rejection was based on an interpretation of the instant claims which included the ceramic substrate as comprising a glass. As apparent from the instant specification, the substrate may or may not contain glass and the working examples employed an alumina substrate which does not contain glass. In order to advance prosecution of this case, the claims have been amended to specify that the ceramic substrate is glass free. Dependent claims to alumina have also been presented.

It is respectfully submitted that no rejection should be advanced against the claims as amended based on JP '936. That reference relates to a laminated glass-ceramic circuit substrate in which all layers contain a glass. Since there is no glass-free substrate, there is obviously no teaching or suggestion concerning the relative wettability of ceramic substrate and the first glass containing layer or of the wettability of the first glass containing layer and the second glass containing layer. In addition, the comments made in the last response filed 19 May 2003 are believed to be applicable and they are incorporated herein by reference.

The early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Dated: December 16, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant